respectfully conclude that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 17-21, and 23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Izutani in view of Snell, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Izutani in view of Snell.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a:

> " computer system comprising...a processor...a case for supporting said processor....said case having a slot located therein for receiving a stylus...a detector for detecting said stylus in said slot...a switch coupled to said detector...to power up said processor...and wherein said switch is also for generating a signal to place said processor, said display screen and said digitizer into a power conservation mode when said stylus is inserted into said slot."

Izutani in combination with Snell does not show or suggest the claimed limitation of "a detector for detecting said stylus in said slot" and "a switch coupled to said detector...to power up said processor". Rather, Izutani teaches mechanically pressing a pen down for turning on and off a power switch that stops the power to the information processor. Specifically, Izutani fails to teach or suggest a "detector" for detecting a stylus in a slot. This is in contrast to a detector that detects the stylus in the slot and activates a switch to power up a processor as claimed. Although Izutani does teach a detector in Figure 9, the detector as taught by Izutani is for generating an alarm as a warning when the stylus is absent from the slot and the power is off. However, Izutani never describes nor suggests the use of the detector of Figure 9 to control a switch that regulates power to the system. Snell, similarly, does not teach "a detector for detecting said stylus in said slot" and "a switch coupled to said detector...to power up said processor".

Snell only teaches a tether for connecting a digitizer pen to a handheld computer. Therefore, the combination of Snell and Izutani fails to teach or suggest the claim language cited above.

Similarly, independent Claim 10 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

> "In a computer system comprising a processor,...a display screen and a digitizer, a method of using said computer system comprising the steps of:...detecting a user removing a stylus from a slot in a case....to power-up said computer system;....detecting a user inserting said stylus into said slot of said case;...placing said processor...in a power conservation mode to power-down said computer system."

As stated above, nowhere does Izutani, in view of Snell, suggest the claimed limitation of "detecting a user removing a stylus" or "detecting a user inserting a stylus" as a means for powering up or powering down a computer system (emphasis added). Izutani discloses a push type power switch that is toggled on and off by pushing the push type power switch and Snell teaches a tether for connecting a digitizer pen to a handheld computer. Therefore, the combination of Snell and Izutani fails to teach or suggest the claim language cited above.

Independent Claim 18 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a:

> "computer system comprising a processor,...a case for supporting said processor,...said case having a slot located therein for receiving a hinge attached to a protective cover...a detector...switch coupled to said detector for generating a signal to automatically power up said processor...when said hinge is rotated...and...to automatically place said

processor...into a power conservation mode when said hinge is rotated such that ..."

Applicants respectfully submit that Izutani in combination with Snell does not show or suggest hinge devices, particularly hinge devices in a protective cover for rotating to power up and place in a conservation mode a processor, a display screen and a digitizer as recited in independent Claim 18. As mentioned above, Izutani teaches a push type mechanical power switch that is toggled on and off by pushing on said power switch and Snell teaches a tether for connecting a digitizer pen to a handheld computer. Nowhere does the combination of Snell and Izutani teach or suggest the hinge type cover, as recited in Claim 18.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Izutani and Snell does not teach or suggest the embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 10 and 18. As such, Applicants further submit that the combination of Izutani and Snell also does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 12, 14, 15 and 17 dependent on Claim 10 and Claims 19-21 and 23 dependent on Claim 18.

Further, Claims 4, 14 and 20 claim that the detector located within the slot is an electrical detector. Snell teaches a tether for connecting a digitizer pen to a handheld computer and Izutani teaches a push type mechanical power switch located within the slot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 14, and 20 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are allowable.

Claims 3, 6, 11, 13, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izutani in view of Snell as applied to Claims 1, 10, and 18 above and further in view of Ogawa (6,100,538). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully conclude that the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 6, 13, 16, and 22 which depend from independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Izutani in combination with Snell and Ogawa for the following reasons. Claims 6, 16 and 22 claim a constant supply of power to the memory unit even when in a power conservation mode. E.g., power down. Izutani does not teach maintaining a constant supply of power to the memory unit during power down because Izutani does not claim or teach a memory unit. Snell, similarly, does not teach maintaining a constant supply of power to the memory during power down because Snell teaches a tether for connecting a digitizer pen to a handheld computer. Ogawa does not teach maintaining a constant supply of power to the memory unit during power down because Ogawa does not claim or teach a memory unit. For this additional reason, dependent Claims 6, 16 and 22 are allowable.

Moreover, dependent Claims 3 and 13 claim a detector located within the slot that is an optical detector. This additional feature is not taught or suggested by the art of record. Snell teaches a tether for connecting a digitizer pen to a handheld computer and Izutani teaches a mechanical push type power switch located within the slot. Although Ogawa teaches an optical detector, the optical detector taught by Ogawa is for determining the position of a projected light and is disposed on the periphery of a coordinate plane, and <u>not</u> in the slot for a stylus. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3 and 13 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are therefore allowable.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the embodiments of the present claimed invention are patentable over Izutani in view of Snell and further in view of Ogawa.

Applicant has reviewed the following patents which were cited but not relied upon and respectfully asserts that the present claimed invention overcomes these references: US 5,584,054, US 5,646,649, US 5,889,888 and US 5,894,580.

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of these Claims is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 5/9/2002

Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060